

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-13, 18-33, 35-39 and 41-47 were presented for examination and all claims were rejected. In the present amendment, claims 1, 9, 10, 18, 19, 25, 26, 28-30, 42, 43 and 47 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced. Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-13, 18-33, 35-39 and 41-47 will be currently pending in this application, of which claims 1 and 30 are independent. Claims 2-13, 18-29, 46 and 47 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1, as amended. Claims 31-33, 35-39 and 41-45 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of independent claim 30, as amended. Applicants submit that pending claims 1-13, 18-33, 35-39 and 41-47 are patentable and in condition for allowance.

The following comments address all stated grounds of rejection. Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections and urge the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance in view of the remarks set forth below.

**CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102****I. Claims 1-13, 18-33, 35-39 and 41-47 Anticipated by Underwood**

Claims 1-13, 18-33, 35-39 and 41-47 are rejected as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,100,195 to Underwood (“Underwood”) under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to the extent they are maintained over the claims as amended, and submit that Underwood fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention.

A. Amended Independent Claims 1 and 30 Not Anticipated By Underwood

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Independent claims 1 and 30, as amended, are directed towards a method and system respectively, for providing a client node authorized remote access to one or more application sessions. These claims recite making an access control decision for the requested resource by applying a policy to the request and identifying, based on the access control decision, an application session to which the client node is permitted to connect. The application session is identified from one or more application sessions already associated with the user and disconnected from one or more client nodes previously operated by the user. Therefore, the claims explicitly recite systems and methods in which the access control decision is made before the client connects to a session. Applicants submit that Underwood fails to disclose each and every feature of independent claims 1 and 30.

Underwood discloses a system for managing user access to eCommerce services. The user first creates a websession (user session) via an authentication process and thereafter accesses certain pages via an authorization process. Underwood, therefore, discloses that any authorization process to access a page occurs after a websession connection is established (col. 58, lines 30-39, and col. 113, lines 34-37). Accordingly, Underwood fails to disclose making an access control decision for the requested resource and identifying, based on the access control decision, an application session to which the client node is permitted to connect.

Moreover, Underwood fails to identify an application session from one or more application sessions already associated with the user and disconnected from one or more client nodes previously operated by the user. In Underwood, instead of identifying any existing sessions, a user creates a new browser application websession to access a page. Consequently,

Underwood fails to contemplate identifying an application session from any number of existing application sessions, let alone one to which the client node is permitted to connect. Moreover, Underwood does not contemplate the existence of disconnected sessions. Consequently, Underwood fails to disclose one or more application sessions already associated with the user and disconnected from one or more client nodes previously operated by the user. In Underwood, instead of having one or more application sessions already associated with the client node, only one web session is associated with the user via an authentication process. Consequently, if the user is denied access to a page within this sole web session, there are no alternatives – Underwood does not provide for identifying, from one or more application sessions, an application session to provide the resource. Therefore, Underwood fails to disclose making an access control decision for the resource based on application of a policy to the received information, and identifying an application session to which the client node is permitted to connect to, the application session from one or more application sessions already associated with the user and disconnected from one or more client nodes previously operated by the user.

For at least the above-discussed reasons, Underwood fails to disclose each and every element of independent claims 1 and 30. Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claims 1 and 30, and dependent claims 2-6 and 14-18, are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully urge the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of claims 1-13, 18-33, 35-39 and 41-47 under 35 U.S.C. §102.

### **CONCLUSION**

In light of the aforementioned amendments and arguments, Applicants contend that each of the Examiners rejections has been adequately addressed and all of the pending claims are in

condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration, withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of all of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorney would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHOATE, HALL & STEWART, LLP

Dated: February 23, 2009

/John D. Lanza/

John D. Lanza

Registration No. 40,060

Attorney for Applicants

Choate, Hall & Stewart, LLP

Two International Place

Boston, MA 02110

(617) 248-5000